

Image Cover Sheet

CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

SYSTEM NUMBER

503830



TITLE

THE ORDER OF MILITARY MERIT STUDY - FINAL REPORT

System Number:

Patron Number:

Requester:

Notes:

DSIS Use only:

Deliver to: FF

Report Documentation Page			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE DEC 1990		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-1990 to 00-00-1990	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Order of Military Merit Study - Final Report			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Defence R&D Canada - Ottawa, 3701 Carling Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Z4,			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT This report presents the findings of a two-phase research study designed to measure both the awareness of, and attitudes toward, the Order of Military Merit (ORMM) program among military personnel in Canada.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 79	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

CANADA

OPERATIONAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS ESTABLISHMENT

DIRECTORATE OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

ORAE PROJECT REPORT NO. PR 536

THE ORDER OF MILITARY MERIT STUDY -
FINAL REPORT

BY

S.B. FLEMMING

ORAE Project Reports present the considered results of project analyses to sponsors and interested agencies in an expeditious manner. They do not necessarily represent the official views of the Canadian Department of National Defence.

OTTAWA, CANADA

DECEMBER, 1990

THIS DOCUMENT IS ISSUED UNDER
ORAE PROJECT 45730
SOCIOLOGY OF THE CANADIAN FORCES

THE ORDER OF MILITARY MERIT STUDY -
FINAL REPORT

ORAE Project Reports present the considered results of project analyses to sponsors and interested agencies in an expeditious manner. They do not necessarily represent the official views of the Canadian Department of National Defence.

Approved by: SB Brown, A/Director for
Chief, Operational Research and Analysis Establishment

ABSTRACT

This report presents the findings of a two-phase research study designed to measure both the awareness of, and attitudes toward, the Order of Military Merit (ORMM) program among military personnel in Canada.

RÉSUMÉ

Ce rapport présente les résultats d'une recherche en deux phases dont le but est de mesurer la perception et l'attitude vis-à-vis du programme «Ordre du Mérite Militaire» (ORMM) parmi le personnel militaire au Canada.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study involved the administration of 4700 questionnaires by mail to members of the Canadian Forces. The analyses discussed in this report would have been impossible without the cooperation and thoughtful comments of those personnel who responded to the survey, and their assistance is greatly appreciated. Many individuals also contributed a great deal of time and effort in significantly improving the quality of the study. They are A S/Lt Andrew Chester, Koi Cheung, Sgt Paul Collins, Mary-Jane Fortin, Pat Huot, Reg Lian, Stephen Pender, Greg Peterson, Arthur Power, Susan Truscott, and Helen Tsiu.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A two-phase program of research was conducted in examining the awareness of, and attitudes toward, the Order of Military Merit (ORMM) program among military personnel in Canada. The main findings of the analysis of the resulting survey data are briefly summarized in the following paragraphs.

- Awareness of the ORMM is low. More than one in three personnel (37.6%) have no familiarity with the program at all. As well, of those who have some familiarity, the program is very much the province of the senior officer, who is ten times more likely than all other personnel to be very familiar with the program.

- Most personnel with at least a little bit of familiarity with the program view it favourably (72.5%). Additionally, it is seen by the great majority (87.5%) as being a credible and worthwhile way of honouring deserving personnel. A minority, however, distrust the fairness of the process used to select personnel for the ORMM. The air operations sector of the CF emerged as the most problematic for the image of the ORMM - personnel in these classifications and trades held the program in the lowest esteem, were least familiar with it, and were least able to recognize one of the ORMM medals.

- Distrust for the process of awarding the ORMM was found to be not strongly associated with low esteem, and as such this distrust is not to be considered an important finding. Factors which were found to be associated with low esteem showed a consistent pattern. Low esteem comes not from dissatisfaction with the policies or characteristics of the program but from the military cynic, who has low respect for all aspects of the military institution and views the ORMM as just one part of a large, inefficient bureaucracy. It is as a result unlikely that a re-structuring of the program will enhance its esteem, as the dissatisfaction with it which does exist is generated by much broader attitudes toward the military having little connection with the program itself. Awareness of the program and esteem were found to be significantly associated, however, suggesting that efforts to increase the visibility of the program might improve its support.

- Despite high regard for the program across a range of measures, the data contained a number of troubling inconsistencies. The report concludes that there is a missing dimension in the manner in which the program is viewed. The ORMM has won the minds but not the hearts of military personnel. It has acquired the respect accorded an important means of recognizing good service, but has not generated the admiration of the sort historically achieved by medals resonating with a standard of commitment and valour impossible to meet in peace-time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
ABSTRACT	i
RÉSUMÉ	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	3
SECTION 1: Awareness of the ORMM Program Among Canadian Forces Personnel	14
SECTION 2: Attitudes of CF Personnel Toward the ORMM Program	22
SECTION 3: Low Esteem for the ORMM: Who and Why	31
SECTION 4: Latent Attitudes Toward the ORMM Program	41
SECTION 5: The Future of the ORMM	47
CONCLUSION	49
BIBLIOGRAPHY	52
ANNEX A: Phase I ORMM Survey	A-1
ANNEX B: Phase II ORMM Survey	B-1

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE 1: Distribution of the Sample Population by Rank	12
TABLE 2: Distribution of the Sample Population By Role Sector	13
TABLE 3: Overall Familiarity with the ORMM	15
TABLE 4: Familiarity with the ORMM by Rank	15
TABLE 5: Ability to Recognize an ORMM Medal By Years of Service	17
TABLE 6: Sources of Information by % of Personnel With Knowledge of the ORMM	20
TABLE 7: Overall Attitude Toward the ORMM Program	24
TABLE 8: Reaction to the Statement: "The ORMM is a Credible and Worthwhile Way of Honouring Deserving Members of the Canadian Military"...	24
TABLE 9: Respondents' Estimates of the Degree of Special Respect Accorded Members with the MMM, OMM, or CMM by all CF Personnel	25
TABLE 10: Reaction to Negative Sentiments Toward the ORMM	29
TABLE 11: Mean Esteem Scale Scores by Rank Level	33
TABLE 12: Mean Esteem Scale Scores by Role Sector	33
TABLE 13: Correlation of Significant Attitudinal Factors with Esteem for the ORMM	36
TABLE 14: Significance Tests for Differences Between Mean Sample Evaluation Scores	44
TABLE 15: One-Way Analysis of Variance Between Sample Evaluations	44
TABLE 16: Overall Attitudes Toward the Future of the ORMM Program	48
TABLE 17: Selection Criteria for the Future of the Program Supported by a Majority of Personnel	48

THE ATTITUDES OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN CANADA
TOWARD THE ORDER OF MILITARY MERIT (ORMM)

Introduction

1. This project has been sponsored by the Directorate of Ceremonial (DC). There is concern that one of the award programs that DC administers among members of the Canadian Forces has developed an incomplete or inappropriate image within the military. Research was designed by DSEA to discover the manifest and latent awareness of and attitudes toward the Order of Military Merit (ORMM) program on the part of military personnel. It was envisaged that the resulting findings would inform DC of the extent to which the program and its policies are known across the Canadian Forces, the degree to which the program is supported as a valuable and credible one, and would permit the identification of sectors of the CF population in which the award is held in low esteem, should such a problem be found.

2. A two-phase research strategy was conducted. The first phase was an attitudinal questionnaire administered to a random sample of military personnel across the armed forces. This phase attempted to explore manifest attitudes toward the program and its future. The second phase sought to extract measurements of latent attitudes toward the ORMM through the use of an innovative survey technique. The results of both of these surveys are presented in this report.

3. In the broadest sense, the portrait which emerges in interpreting the data generated by this study is one of high and consistent esteem for the award across the Forces,

coupled with low but similarly consistent unease for some aspects of the concrete practices which are used to select members for the ORMM. Low esteem for the program and unease with its policies are not associated; in other words, dissatisfaction with the actual process of awarding the ORMM does not diminish the respect the program and its recipients are accorded. Low esteem for the program is found to be associated with a variety of factors, however, many of which are beyond the capabilities of DC to rectify - these include the impact of the "military cynic" who has low esteem for all aspects of military bureaucracy, of which the ORMM is merely a part which is tarred with the same brush. All the significant findings leading to these conclusions are summarized in this report.

4. The report is presented in five substantive sections. In the remainder of this introduction, the methodology employed in each phase of the research is outlined and the samples upon which the analyses are based are described. In the first substantive section, the level of awareness of the program and of its central policies found to be extant among the sample population are described. Section Two reviews the main findings of the study, presenting the central measures used to generate the respondents attitudes toward the validity and credibility of the program. Section Three examines the attitudinal findings in detail, assessing the responses by a range of socio-demographic, military, and attitudinal factors in testing hypotheses seeking to explain low esteem for the ORMM. Section Four reports the findings of Phase II of the study, examining latent attitudes toward the program, while Section Five explores the respondents' views regarding the direction they believe the program should take in the future.

Methodology

5. The most efficient manner of measuring the attitudes of a population toward a given phenomenon is through the use of survey techniques. Despite its efficiency and utility in producing generalizable statistical data, the survey suffers from severe limitations and rarely offers the illumination provided by qualitative techniques, such as interviewing. Recent approaches have expanded the data-gathering potential of the survey, however, and one of these was employed in this study. A two-phase strategy was designed. The first utilized the traditional survey technique, in which a sample of military personnel were asked by mail to respond anonymously to numerous direct questions regarding their attitude toward the ORMM program. The second phase was designed to elicit attitudinal data of greater depth than the manifest opinions generated by direct questioning. Military populations, despite their relatively high willingness to respond to surveys, are among the most difficult to study. The barriers to acquiring valid measurements of latent attitudes are particularly hard to overcome among a disciplined group with a relatively strong corporate identity. This second phase attempted to capture latent attitudes toward the ORMM without asking the respondents directly for their opinion. Each of the two phases of the study are described in detail in the following sections.

is principally awarded. The second test asked the respondents to estimate how many members receive the ORMM annually. Response categories allowed the selection of from "25 or fewer" to "151 or more". The intent here was to discover if the population has an inflated perception of the number of awards being presented; in other words, to find out if members who hold the award in low esteem do so in part because they overestimate the quantity awarded (which, in the case of such awards, serves to diminish their value and credibility). In the broadest sense, this section intended to allow the identification of any segment of the military population having low awareness or knowledge of the ORMM, permitting the targetting of a program to increase the profile of the award where it is most needed. In support of this potential utility of the data, the respondents were given a list of a wide range of possible sources from which they might have heard about the ORMM, including base or unit newspapers, television, official CF documentation, and so on, and were asked to identify those sources from which they had received information on the award. These data may indicate the most appropriate means of increasing members' awareness.

8. The third section of the questionnaire attempted to establish the respondents overall attitude toward the award program and its future. The data generated in this section are at the core of this study, serving as the central measures in discovering the nature and intensity of the attitudes toward the ORMM operating among the military population. Three questions were employed in accomplishing this aim. Firstly, the respondents were asked to select a statement from a five-point scale ranging from "strongly favourable" to "strongly unfavourable" which "best describes" their "overall attitude toward the ORMM".

Secondly, the statement "The ORMM is a credible and worthwhile way of honouring deserving members of the Canadian military" was followed by a five-point scale varying from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree", from which respondents were asked to select the answer most closely approximating their own reaction to that sentiment. Thirdly, a segment evaluated opinions regarding the future of the ORMM program. Respondents were asked if they believe the program should continue in its present form, continue with some changes, be cancelled and replaced with a new program, or be cancelled altogether.

9. The fourth section contained the most difficult variables. The aim here was to identify factors contributing to whatever level of low esteem was found by the previous section. In other words, the ideal design would include the presentation of an exhaustive taxonomy of conceivable negative attitudes which the population might harbour for the ORMM program, in order that the relative currency and intensity of the contribution of each to the overall rate might be assessed. The difficulty is that of discovering all the important potential "causes" of low esteem in order that they might be included in the questionnaire. Twenty semi-structured interviews of military personnel were conducted as a pre-test in assisting with this task. Many of these factors, however, could not be selected systematically, and informed speculation had to be employed in creating a list of as many possible associations with low esteems as possible, so that significant findings might arrive from a relatively thorough process of discovery. The following are some of the many potential sources of disaffection for the award which are addressed by the questionnaire:

- the belief that the ORMM is a consolation award for retiring personnel;
- that political or bureaucratic influences, such as the quality of the nomination proposal, inappropriately affect the award;
- the award is really just a "Super CD", not much different from other programs;
- those with a successful military career or who are motivated more by classic military institutional values than by occupational norms are more likely to support the award; and
- that low esteem for the award comes not from rejection of anything in particular about the award itself, but is part of the blanket rejection of many aspects of military service by service cynics.

10. In the fifth and final section, personnel were given an opportunity to express their views regarding the factors and qualities which they believe should be important in determining which personnel receive the ORMM. A list of twenty such variables was constructed, accompanied by a four-point importance scale ranging from "very important" to "not at all important". A broad selection of factors were chosen, encompassing performance and individual characteristics over the long-term, short-term, and in conditions of peril. An area was provided for the respondents to identify factors of their own choosing which

they believe should be important and were not included in the list. This opportunity for qualitative responses was provided wherever practicable throughout the questionnaire.

11. The sampling frame of personnel chosen to receive the survey was drawn across the Canadian Forces. A total of 2,700 personnel were randomly selected from the total population of the CF for inclusion in Phase I of the study¹. The questionnaire was mailed to individual members directly, and did not require administrative assistance in the field on any level.

¹ This figure was generated with the assistance of the Directorate of Mathematics and Statistics in ORAE.

PHASE II:
MEASURING LATENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ORMM PROGRAM

12. Techniques designed to measure the attitudes of a sample of respondents toward a given variable by relying upon overt questioning, such as that employed in the first phase of this study, suffer from a set of oft-noted weaknesses. The distance between overt opinion, and the set of beliefs underlying and defining the world-view of individuals, particularly in response to queries from official sources, is often substantial. The standard questionnaire ordinarily serves to generate a pale imitation of the latent, and most significant, attitudes of a population. It is on the level of the unarticulated that useful insights should be sought. If the sample population is small and a great deal of time and resources are available, intensive interviewing and observation techniques may be used to take the research past the superficiality of opinion. However, if the sample population must be large, the quality of the data must to some extent be sacrificed to the scale demanded for statistically generalizable findings. Methodological innovations designed to limit these damaging effects have been developed, however, and one of these is employed in this phase of the study.

13. The technique was adapted from work advanced by Labovitz (1979). On the broadest level, the goal of the technique is to extract information from respondents indirectly, avoiding the contaminating effects of conscious, overt attention. In Labovitz' research, evidence of latent discriminatory sexual and ethnic attitudes was sought by having respondents evaluate a short piece of previously published research. Each individual participating in the study was asked to read the piece and comment upon its

quality. The name of the author attached to the written work varied by sex and ethnicity. An anglophone male, an anglophone female, a Native-Canadian male, and a francophone male were identified as authors of the same report.. Significant differences in the reported quality of the document across the groups were attributed to attitudes toward the influence of the independent variable, the sexuality or ethnicity of the author implied by the different names attached to the same document. The groups evaluating the work for which the author was identified as an anglophone male considered it of higher quality than did those examining the same work in the three remaining groups by a statistically significant margin. Had traditional survey techniques been employed in that research, that latent insight could not have been found. Other examples of the utility of the technique are found in Larimer (1970) and, Goldberg (1968). It was determined that the context of this research was amenable to the conditions needed for an amended version of this technique.

14. A short summary of the findings of a study of occupational stress in the Canadian Forces previously conducted by DSEA was written for this research. A questionnaire asking respondents to evaluate the quality of this summary and to make judgements about the skills of its author was also designed (the summary and questionnaire are contained in Annex B). The author of the summary was identified as "Major J.D. Richard" in a control group of 1,000 surveys. An experimental group of a further 1,000 surveys identified the author of the same report as "Major J.D. Richard, OMM". Comparison of the perceptions of the two sample populations will reveal, if the technique is successful, latent orientations toward the ORMM program extent among the CF population. The data will indicate if a

strong current of opinion exists regarding the credibility of the ORMM, in either a positive or negative direction, if significant differences are consistently found between the two sample populations' evaluation of the same written work.

15. Two research strategies were designed for this study. In the first, a traditional survey questionnaire was used to elicit manifest opinions toward the ORMM program and its future. The survey is included in this report as Annex A. The second strategy used an indirect measurement technique designed to elicit latent attitudes toward the ORMM. The survey employed in this regard is found in Annex B. The combination of these approaches provides, it is hoped, a valid and reliable appreciation of the attitudes of personnel across the CF toward the ORMM program.

The Sample Population

16. The analysis of the Phase I data is based upon 1059 valid responses. As 2700 questionnaires had been sent to a random sample of personnel in every military occupation, the response rate was 39%. As the survey was administered immediately prior to posting season, this level of response is to be considered high and relatively strong. The constitution of the response population approximated the distribution of socio-demographic core measures throughout the broader Canadian Forces within acceptable ranges and the resulting data are employed in this report as measures of the attitudes of the CF as a whole.

TABLE 1

The Distribution of the Sample Population by Rank

<u>Rank</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n=</u>
Senior Officer	8.0	84
Junior Officer	17.6	185
Senior NCM	32.5	343
Junior NCM	41.9	442
Total	100.0	1054

17. The distribution of the sample population responding to the survey is summarized by rank in Table 1. Senior officers constituted 8% (n=84) of the sample, while junior officers accounted for 17.6% (n=185). Senior other-ranks personnel made up a further 32.5% (n=343) of all the members responding, while the remaining 41.9% (n=442) were junior other-rank personnel.

18. It is of course most important that members of each "role sector", or general type of military employment, be included in a broad attitudinal survey. In the case of this sample, each role sector is well represented. The distribution of respondents by role sector is summarized in Table 2. The three operational sectors of the land, sea, and air groups comprise 24.5% (n=254), 24.6% (n=255), and 11.7% (n=121) of the sample respectively. Personnel providing active administrative, personnel, or logistics support to an operational unit made up 17.9% (n=185) of the total sample, with those performing these duties in a base or static role constituting the remaining 21.3% (n=221).

TABLE 2

The Distribution of the Sample Population by Role Sector

<u>Role Sector</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n=</u>
Operational Land	24.5	254
Operational Air	24.6	255
Operational Sea	11.7	121
Admin, Pers, or Log in active support to operational unit	17.9	185
Admin, Pers, or Log in a base or static role	21.3	221
Total	100.0	1036

19. The three remaining categories of note are the sexual, language, and military experience characteristics of the sample population. Female service members were represented by 8.7% (n=92) of those responding to the survey, the great majority of 91.3% (n=964) being male. In terms of language, 66.3% (n=693) identified English as their primary language while 33.4% (n=353) so identified French. The years of service which the personnel responding to the survey had experienced in their careers ranged from one year or less to thirty-seven years, with an overall mean of 13.4 years. These sample distribution characteristics provide an appropriate base from which to explore the attitudes of the wider Canadian Forces population. In the following section, the first of the substantive sections on this report, the responses of this sample population are employed in considering how aware are military personnel of the ORMM program. The characteristics of the smaller sample used in the second phase of the study are briefly described in Section Four.

SECTION 1:

AWARENESS OF THE ORMM PROGRAM
AMONG CANADIAN FORCES PERSONNEL

20. Three measures were employed in establishing the extent to which military personnel are aware of the ORMM award program. The first two of these asked the respondents to self-report their level of awareness of the program, by firstly indicating the degree to which they felt familiar with it on a four-point scale ranging from "very familiar" to "not at all familiar" and secondly by noting if they could or could not recognize a medal of the ORMM if it were worn by another member. The third measure, while not particularly difficult, did not afford the luxury of self-reporting and demanded that a minimum knowledge of how the ORMM program works be demonstrated. Respondents were asked to identify the principal reason that a member is awarded the ORMM from a list of four possible such policies, only one of which was correct. In the following paragraphs, the results of these tests are described, and significant differences emerging within the CF population in terms of rank, role sector and among other group characteristics are identified where each were found. The section concludes with a description of the sources through which personnel have become familiar with the ORMM, and a discussion of the relative importance of each.

1. Familiarity with the Program

21. Just 6.3% (n=66) of the sample described themselves as "very familiar" with the ORMM program (see Table 3). A majority of 56.1% (n=592) were less certain, describing themselves as "somewhat" or "a little bit familiar". More

TABLE 3

Overall Degree of Familiarity with the ORMM

	<u>%</u>	<u>n=</u>
Very Familiar	6.3	66
Somewhat Familiar	23.5	248
A Little Bit Familiar	32.6	344
Not At All Familiar	37.6	396
Total	100.0	1054

TABLE 4

Degree of Familiarity with the ORMM by Rank (in %)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Very Familiar</u>	<u>Somewhat Familiar</u>	<u>A Little Bit Familiar</u>	<u>Not At All Familiar</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>No.</u>
Senior Officer	39.8	36.1	16.9	7.2	100.0	84
Junior Officer	7.1	23.4	37.5	32.1	100.0	185
Senior NCM	4.1	35.4	34.8	25.7	100.0	343
Junior NCM	1.4	12.2	31.5	54.9	100.0	442
Total	6.3	23.6	32.5	37.6	100.0	1059

than one of every three personnel, 37.6% (n=396), were "not at all familiar" with the ORMM. This last finding was unexpectedly high, and may be regarded as among the most significant emerging from this analysis.

22. Significant variations were found which illuminate this finding. The ORMM is a program whose chief constituency is senior officers. As Table 4 shows, senior officers are clearly distinguished from all remaining rank groups in terms of their familiarity with the ORMM. While some variation occurs among other groups, senior officers stand apart in the data to a remarkable degree - the

distinction is so pronounced, it is as if the samples were drawn from wholly separate populations. Four in ten (39.8%, n=33) senior officers are "very familiar" with the ORMM while fewer than four in a hundred of all other personnel (3.4%, n=33) described their awareness in this manner.

23. Males are more familiar with the program than are females; half of the women in the sample (n=46) described themselves as "not at all familiar". Similarly, anglophones are more familiar than are francophones, but both these findings are a function of rank and years of service. Francophones are relatively under-represented at the senior-officer level and females tend not to remain in military service as long as males, and are also relatively under-represented at the senior officer level. As a result, these nominal differences should not be regarded as significant. The point of note here is that senior officers are very much aware of the program, and all others are dramatically less so.

2. Recognition of the ORMM Medals

24. A majority of personnel (54.1%, n=571) believe that they would be able to recognize a medal of the ORMM on sight. A total of 40.3% (n=425) admit that they could not do so, while the remaining 5.6% (n=59) were unsure.

25. It was again found that anglophones and males claimed more awareness of the program through their ability to recognize its medals than did francophones and females. As well, variations occurred by rank - senior officers are more likely than junior officers to be able to recognize the medals, and senior NCM's are more likely to do so than are junior NCM's. The finding of note, however, is in years of

TABLE 5

Ability to Recognize an ORMM Medal by
Years of Service (in %)

<u>Years In</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>n=</u>
0-5	30.5	62.4	7.0	100.0	213
6-10	53.8	41.0	5.2	100.0	249
11-15	45.1	45.5	9.4	100.0	215
16-20	64.4	32.2	3.4	100.0	147
21-25	74.3	23.9	1.8	100.0	114
26+	80.9	16.5	2.6	100.0	115
Total	54.0	40.5	5.5	100.0	1053

service. As Table 5 indicates, the longer a member has been in military service, the more likely it is that the medal can be recognized. While just 30.5% (n=65) of those having 5 or fewer years of service stated that they could recognize an ORMM medal, some 80.9% (n=93) of those with 26 or more years in uniform responded that they would in fact know it if they saw it.

3. Awareness of The Aim of the Program

26. Respondents to the survey were presented with a choice of four possible central principals which might be employed in selecting personnel to be awarded the ORMM and were asked to select the correct one. A small group of 4.9% (n=31) selected "Acts of courage in circumstances of great peril". Others believed that "Distinguished public service to Canadian society" was the direct aim of the recognition afforded by the ORMM (10.6%, n=68). A larger proportion,

35.2% (n=225), selected "Performance beyond the demands of normal duty". Almost half, 45.2% (n=289) correctly identified "Outstanding meritorious service in positions of responsibility". The remaining 4.1% (n=26) were unsure. While almost half were aware of the aim of the program, the high proportion selecting the anodyne "Performance beyond the demands of normal duty" is troubling. This indicates a perception that the award is given for performance which is not at all extraordinary. Tests discussed later in this report examine this possibility in much greater detail.

27. The distribution of responses to this query were also found to vary by years of service. While just 34.8% (n=24) of those with 5 or fewer years in uniform could correctly identify the aim of the program, 56.5% (n=52) of those with 26 or more years in could correctly do so. Variance by rank also followed the pattern set by medal recognition - those of higher rank at either the officer or NCM level were more likely to be able to correctly identify the aim of the program.

28. Few of the findings generated by this analysis will surprise. It is in all ways reasonable that those with higher rank or longer service will know more about the military. Two points of note have emerged, however. The first is the magnitude of the lack of awareness and knowledge of the ORMM. More than one in three members were found to have no familiarity with the program at all. The second is that awareness of the program is very much the province of the senior officer, who is more than ten times as likely to be very familiar with the program as are all other personnel combined.

4. Improving Awareness of the ORMM

29. In this concluding segment of Section 1, two related goals are accomplished. If it is determined that a problem exists with respect to the extent to which CF personnel are aware of the ORMM, there are two ways in which the data collected in this survey might be of use in designing ways to increase awareness. Firstly, it is possible to describe in qualitative terms that sector of the military which is least aware of the program, and as such is likely to be the group targeted for information. Secondly, the respondents were asked if they had become aware of the ORMM through a range of typical sources of information and those responses may indicate areas in which the improvement of information flows is needed.

(1) The Target Population

30. In general terms, low awareness is wide and deep. Recruits, or those with one year or less service, are least likely to be aware of the program. Low awareness is endemic among all those other than senior officers. The problem is relatively more concentrated, however, among females, francophones, and those in air operational classifications and trades (of whom half, 49.6% n=126, are not at all familiar). Knowledge of the program, represented by the ability to recognize one of its medals and to correctly select its aim varies most importantly with time in service. Junior personnel at both the officer and NCM level display less likelihood of recognizing a medal or knowing the aim. The problem in this area is again more concentrated among females, francophones, and those in the air operations sector, of whom 50% (n=127) admit they are unable to recognize a medal of ORMM.

TABLE 6

Sources of Information by % of Personnel
Receiving Knowledge About the ORMM

<u>Source</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n=</u>
Knowing a member with the ORMM personally	70.3	460
Base, unit, or other military newspaper	66.7	437
Official CF notices or documentation	63.9	418
Discussion with other personnel	57.9	378
Civilian newspaper, radio, or television	16.9	111

(2) Sources of Program Awareness

31. Respondents were asked to indicate if they had in their own experience received information on the ORMM from five common sources of information. The findings are contained in Table 6. The range of ways that personnel might have heard about or obtained information about the ORMM included newspapers and the media, personal contact and discussion, and from official CF sources. It should be noted that respondents who indicated they were "not at all familiar" with the ORMM did not complete this section of the survey; all the data in Table 6 were provided by personnel with at least some familiarity with the program.

32. The most important source of contact with the ORMM program is actually knowing someone who has received it. A full 70.3% (n=460) of personnel indicate that they have known such a member. Two of every three respondents had either read about the ORMM in a military newspaper (66.7%, n=437) or in an official CF notice or publication (63.9%, n=418). More than half recall discussing the award with

other personnel - a total of 57.9% (n=378). This level may be an indication of a problem, recalling that it does not include all those initially unfamiliar with the program. The extent to which personnel actually discuss or are motivated to take notice of the ORMM may be quite low. Finally, a minority recall having heard about the ORMM (16.9%, n=111) in civilian media.

33. To this point, the analysis has sought to examine the visibility of the program. In the following section, the central findings of the study with respect to the credibility and acceptance of the ORMM accorded by military personnel are reviewed.

SECTION TWO:

ATTITUDES OF CF PERSONNEL TOWARD THE ORMM PROGRAM

34. This section presents the central findings of this study, examining the overall value orientation of military personnel in Canada toward the ORMM program. Descriptive summary statistics will be employed for this purpose; more sophisticated techniques are used in the section which follows in seeking to explain the underlying influences which inform these general findings. The data are considered in three segments. In the first, the three critical measures of overall attitudes toward the program are described. In the second, the relative extent to which the respondents believe a wide range of factors are operating in the process of awarding the ORMM is discussed. Thirdly, the currency of a set of specific negative beliefs about the program is explored. It must be noted that all the findings in this section refer to personnel in the Forces who have at least some familiarity with the ORMM. Personnel with no familiarity did not answer detailed questions regarding the program.

1. Critical Measures of Attitudes Toward The Program

35. Three measures were included in the survey which sought to identify dimensions of the value orientation of military personnel toward the ORMM. These comprised the degree to which respondents described their attitude as favourable, the extent of their agreement with the view that the ORMM is a credible and worthwhile way of honouring military personnel, and their opinion regarding the respect which all members accord those awarded a medal of the ORMM.

36. The first measure asked respondents to select a statement on a five-point scale ranging from "strongly favourable" to "strongly unfavourable" which best described their overall attitude toward the program. As Table 7 demonstrates, members of the CF have a clearly favourable orientation toward the program. A full 72.5% (n=464²) are strongly favourable or favourable towards it, while a small group of just 3.7% (n=24) are unfavourable or strongly unfavourable. In the broadest sense, then, it is appropriate to conclude that members of the CF have a favourable orientation toward the ORMM, to an extent which may exceed the expectations of those familiar with the program.

37. The second measure asked respondents to indicate their degree of agreement on a five-point scale with the following statement: "The ORMM is a credible and worthwhile way of honouring deserving members of the Canadian military". As Table 8 shows, the response was unequivocal. A total of 87.5% (n=572) of the sample agreed or agreed strongly with this sentiment. A remarkable 45.7% (n=299) of all respondents agreed strongly. These findings provide complementary proofs of the strong general positive orientation of Canadian personnel toward the ORMM program.

² As personnel "not at all familiar" with the ORMM did not complete the substantive areas of the survey, the sample size is reduced throughout the remainder of the analysis.

TABLE 7

Overall Attitude Toward The ORMM Program

Strongly Favourable	25.5	163
Favourable	47.0	301
Neither Favourable nor Unfavourable	23.8	152
Unfavourable	2.8	18
Strongly Unfavourable	.9	6
Total	100.0	640

TABLE 8

Reaction to the Statement: "The ORMM is a Credible
and Worthwhile Way of Honouring Deserving Members
of the Canadian Military"

	<u>%</u>	<u>n=</u>
Strongly Agree	45.7	299
Agree	41.7	273
Neither Agree nor Disagree	8.6	56
Disagree	3.2	21
Strongly Disagree	.8	5
Total	100.0	654

38. The third measure does not support the direction of the attitudes found in the previous paragraphs. Respondents were asked to indicate on a four-point scale ranging from "very high respect" to "no extra respect at all" how much special respect is accorded by the rest of the Forces to members awarded a medal of the ORMM. As the data in Table 9 indicate, a majority of members believe that the ORMM generates no respect or at best a little bit of respect in the eyes of other military personnel (53.8%, n=336). Given the high esteem which members themselves accord the program, this finding is a surprise, and an indication that a problem does exist in attitudes toward the program. Despite the unequivocally positive orientation toward the program on the

TABLE 9

Respondents' Estimates of the
Degree of Special Respect Accorded Members
with the MMM, OMM, or CMM by all CF Personnel

	<u>%</u>	<u>n=</u>
Very High Respect	14.4	90
Some Special Respect	31.8	199
A Little Bit of Extra Respect	32.5	203
No Extra Respect at All	<u>21.3</u>	<u>133</u>
Total	100.0	625

most general level, members believe that the award is held in relatively low esteem by other personnel. This problem suggests that the three central measures were not sufficiently sensitive to capture the essence of overall attitudes toward the program. The data contained in the remaining segments of this section, however, help to illuminate the dichotomy in orientation found by the central measures.

2. Attitudes Toward The Mechanics of The Program

39. In this segment, a set of specific factors in the day-to-day operation of the program are considered. The goal of this part of the survey was to extract a taxonomy of influences which personnel believe serve to define who receives a medal of ORMM. As honesty and the freedom to select less than pristine influences as being of significance was paramount, respondents were told to consider the list of factors "in the real world" of their experience. Each of the 23 factors was accompanied by a four-point degree of importance scale, which ranged from "very important" to "not at all important". The selection

process used to generate the list of factors is described earlier in this report.

40. The dichotomy problem emerges in greater relief with this set of findings. There is no doubt but that the respondents believe that outstanding personnel actually do receive the award, but a disturbing minority demonstrate a lack of respect for the process used to select these members. In descending order, the sample believed that the most important factors working "in the real world" to determine who gets the award (produced by combining the proportions believing each was "very" or "somewhat" important) are the members' dedication and dependability (87.7%, n=573), devotion to duty (86.7%, n=565), loyalty to superiors (81.6%, n=533), meritorious service in positions of responsibility (80.8%, n=522), and loyalty to subordinates (74.8%, n=487). While this shows clear respect for the outcome of the process, in that the people who eventually receive the award are seen as very strong candidates, the process itself is not regarded so highly. A majority of 57.3% (n=365) think that having a quality nomination proposal on behalf of the candidate is an important factor in determining if an award is received. A further 36.7% (n=235) believe that being a good bureaucrat helps, and 28.3% (n=182) conclude that being a good "military politician" is also important. Luck was viewed by a substantial minority as being important; 28.7% (n=184) believe that "being in the right place at the right time" is significant, and also that playing the game by the rules matters - more than one in four (26.1%, n=167) believe that "never complaining about or disagreeing with policy" is important. The system is further seen by many to exclude reservists and regular support personnel, as 29.9% (n=177)

believe that regulars are more likely to be awarded than reservists and 21.1% (n=131) conclude that operational status is an advantage. The influence of the oft-noted "consolation award" upon retirement factor was seen as important by 16.1% (n=103) of respondents.

41. The portrait which thus emerges is one of high esteem for the medals and the individuals who wear them, accompanied by a significant undercurrent of suspicion for the fairness and legitimacy of the process designed to select individuals to be awarded. It is reasonable to speculate that some degree of suspicion for the process should be expected to associated with the ORMM, as it lacks clear and widely understood specific criteria of performance for which the award is tendered. In the following final segment of this section, the currency of a set of specific negative attitudes identified in interviews and consultations with the sponsor as possibly afflicting the program are explored, as well as the implications of the data they generated for the interpretation of overall attitudes toward the program.

3. Specific Negative Attitudes Toward The Program

42. In addition to the concrete mechanisms of the program discussed in the previous paragraphs, of which a number might be regarded as contrary to its aims, the survey presented to the respondents a set of negative attitudes also in opposition to the spirit of the ORMM. This section of the survey attempted to establish the prevalence and intensity of the adherence of CF personnel to these attitudes.

43. Seven statements were presented to the respondents, each containing a clearly defined sentiment in opposition to the ORMM. A five-point agreement scale accompanied each, and the combination of the proportions both agreeing and strongly agreeing with each statement permits an appreciation of their occurrence in the population. In Table 10, the seven statements are listed in full and the proportion agreeing with each is identified.

44. Three statements generated relatively insignificant support. Few accept the view that the ORMM is just one meaningless part of an already too large bureaucracy. A similarly small proportion agreed that the ORMM is indistinguishable from other CF awards, while a full 80.3% (n=512) actively disagreed with the idea that too many awards are given by the CF for any of them to really matter. Limited but significant support was found for two others, as one in five (19.8%, n=110) indicated that most members of the CF in their experience have a low opinion of the program, and 28.5% (n=178) supported the view that the ORMM should be regarded as just a "Super CD". The remaining two statements generated substantial agreement. A total of 42.5% (n=266) believe that time has eroded the value of all awards provided by the Forces, a view which is not directed specifically at the ORMM. Finally, almost half of those surveyed (44.1%, n=261) agreed that "The ORMM is awarded to people for the wrong reasons", and that the people who truly deserve recognition go unrewarded. This finding is further evidence of the distrust some personnel feel for the process employed to select members for the award. The following section explores the sources of this distrust.

45. This section considered the results of central measures of the survey. In the design stage, these measures

TABLE 10

Reaction to Negative Sentiments Toward the ORMM

<u>Statement</u>	<u>% Agreeing</u>	<u>n=</u>
1. "The ORMM is awarded to people for the wrong reasons; the people in the Forces who most deserve to be rewarded often are not the people who receive it".	44.1	261
2. "Awards of all kinds in the Forces don't mean as much as they used to"	42.5	265
3. "The ORMM is really a 'Super CD' that is awarded not necessarily to exceptional personnel but to those who stay in for a full career and are very loyal"	28.5	178
4. "Most members of the Forces whom I have talked to about the ORMM have little respect for the program"	19.8	110
5. "The ORMM means very little. It is just part of the bureaucracy, which is too large and inefficient"	13.6	86
6. "There is not much difference between the ORMM and the other awards the CF gives out, like the CD and so on. None of them are really special"	12.5	81
7. "Too many awards of all kinds are given out for any of them to really matter"	7.5	48

were intended to capture the overall attitudes of personnel, on the most general level, toward the ORMM program. The data revealed two important findings. Members of the Forces respect the ORMM and the people who have received it, and

believe it is a credible symbolic award. A significant minority, however, distrust the process employed in selecting members for the award. While they are strongly positive toward the award on an abstract level, many have reservations on the level of the particular in the fairness of the way that people are chosen to receive it. In the following section, low esteem for the award is examined through a range of statistical tests with the goal of isolating the factors that "cause", or more appropriately, contribute to, disfavour for the award. As well, the tests attempt to discover if the mistrust for process that has been found is worthy of concern from a statistical point of view, and if strategies for ameliorating this mistrust can be identified.

SECTION THREE:

LOW ESTEEM FOR THE ORMM - WHO AND WHY

46. In the previous section, a range of indicators were marshalled in attempting to illuminate the attitudes of military personnel toward the ORMM on the most general level. In this section, the distribution of the central measures - the extent to which personnel view the program favourably - is examined in terms of the impact of other factors. The aim is to identify specific influences serving to enhance or diminish the esteem accorded the award. If successful, the results might be used to target the military population in which the award is held in low esteem, as well as to suggest appropriate strategies to improve the image of the program.

47. The analysis is conducted in three stages. In the first, the impact of socio-demographic factors on esteem for the award is examined. In the second, the influence of the reaction to the "real world" aspects of the process of the award program is considered, while in the third stage a set of independent hypotheses offering alternative explanations is tested. The first stage asks if variation in esteem for the award is in part a function of individuals location within the military or their own background. The second stage asks if there are certain aspects of the program which decrease the overall respect given to the ORMM. Each test in the third stage is explained separately as it is conducted.

STAGE ONE:

Socio-Demographic Factors and Esteem for the Program

48. The influence of the factors that will be considered here are rank, role sector, military experience, sex, and language. In the case of rank, role sector, and military experience, the extent to which each category of personnel within these groups views the award favourably is compared with the overall distribution of esteem. The five-point scale on which this esteem was measured, ranging from a score of "1" meaning strongly unfavourable to "5", meaning strongly favourable, generated an overall population mean score of 3.93 ($n=640$, $sd=0.83$), and it is against this value that categories of these variables will be measured. In the case of sex and language, the mean scores of the two categories within each are compared directly.

49. It was discovered earlier in this report that awareness of the program is related to rank, insofar as senior officers are significantly more aware than are other personnel. That finding is not echoed here, as is shown in Table 11. Despite their greater attention to the program, senior officers are in fact somewhat less disposed to favour the ORMM than most other personnel. Somewhat surprisingly, perhaps, the highest scores were found among non-commissioned members; these scores were not, however, significantly different from the population mean. Only junior officers, with a mean score of 3.75 on the esteem scale, differed from the population to a significant degree. Junior officers are less favourably disposed toward the ORMM than are all personnel ($t=-2.202$, $p<.05$).

TABLE 11

Mean Esteem Scale Scores by Rank Level

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>n=</u>
Senior Officers	3.82	.91	76
Junior Officers	3.75	.80	122
Senior NCM's	3.99	.83	246
Junior NCM's	<u>4.03</u>	<u>.80</u>	<u>193</u>
Total	3.93	.83	640

TABLE 12

Mean Esteem Scale Scores by Role Sector

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>n=</u>
Operational Land	3.98	.90	254
Operational Air	3.80	.80	123
Operational Sea	3.85	.79	79
Admin, Pers, Log in active support to an operational unit	4.16	.78	106
Admin, Pers, Log in a base or static role	3.93	.75	151
Total	<u>3.93</u>	<u>.83</u>	<u>640</u>

50. Significant findings were discovered across military role sectors. Table 12 contains the mean scores in this regard. Two sectors differed significantly from the overall population. In a positive direction, the most favourable support for the program is found among administrative, personnel, and logistics members in trades and classifications serving in active support to an operational unit; their mean score of 4.16 was significantly higher than the population mean at the 1% level ($t=2.635$, $p<.01$). In a negative direction, the least favourable support is

among air operations personnel, whose mean score of 3.80 is significantly lower than the population mean at the 5% level ($t=-1.678$, $p<.05$). A trend is emerging regarding the air operations sector. It was previously determined that that group was the least familiar with the program and also the least likely to recognize the award itself; in addition, they are least favourably disposed toward it.

51. No significant differences were found with respect to military experience or sex. Regardless of time in service, attitudes toward the program do not deviate. Males and females similarly do not view the ORMM from a differing value orientation.

52. Personnel whose primary language is French had a mean score of 4.04 ($n=207$, $sd=.83$) on the esteem scale, while those for whom English is the primary language scored 3.89 ($n=426$, $sd=.82$). Francophones view the ORMM with significantly higher esteem than do anglophones at the 5% level ($t=2.21$, $p<.05$).

53. While significant differences were found within some variables, no distinct patterns strongly associated with the degree of esteem measure were found through the examination of socio-demographic factors. However, it was observed that support for the program is relatively stronger among personnel supporting operational units and francophones, and is relatively weaker among junior officers and personnel in air operational trades and classifications.

STAGE TWO:

Mechanisms of the Award Process and Overall Esteem

54. In this segment, reactions of personnel to specific mechanisms of the award process are reviewed to determine their impact on the degree of support for the program. This analysis will permit an evaluation of the importance of the finding that a minority of personnel distrust the process of the ORMM. If this distrust contributes to low esteem for the overall program, then it will be appropriate to conclude that the finding of distrust on the part of a minority is in fact an important one.

55. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated in measuring the association between each item in a set of attitudinal variables and the overall esteem measure. The set included both the "real world" processual factors and the specific negative sentiment measures described earlier in this report. The identification of the degree to which each variable is associated with overall esteem serves to indicate where the most serious problems reside. Those factors most highly correlated with esteem in a negative direction illustrate the factors most associated with low esteem for the program.

56. The resulting correlation matrix is contained in Table 13. Very low coefficients were dropped from the analysis. The factors identified in the Table are all those found to be well associated with esteem in either a positive or negative direction. The portrait which emerges has important ramifications. Virtually all of the factors measuring reactions to concrete aspects of the process of awarding the ORMM were not associated with the esteem. Only the view that the wrong reasons are employed in the

TABLE 13

Correlation of Significant Attitudinal
Factors with Esteem for the ORMM

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Pearson r^2</u>
1. ORMM means little, just apart of a large, inefficient military bureaucracy	-.48
2. All CF awards are really the same, none are special	-.43
3. Other members of the Forces have little respect for the program	-.36
4. ORMM is awarded for the wrong reasons, deserving people don't receive it	-.31
5. All awards don't mean as much as they used to	-.29
6. Those devoted to duty are more likely to receive it	.26

selection criteria, at $r^2 = -.31$, was found to be associated with esteem in a negative direction. None of the remaining factors of this type, including the notion that the award is used as a "consolation" for those about to retire, were found to be associated with overall esteem for the award. The factors found to most strongly underly low esteem, however, measure attitudes with no direct connection to the award itself. The notion that the ORMM means little because it is just part of the large and inefficient military bureaucracy was most strongly associated at $r^2 = -.48$, while the view that the ORMM is nothing special because all CF awards are basically the same at $r^2 = -.43$ was next most strongly correlated. The remaining negatively correlated

factors also measured attitudes external to the award itself; the views that other members have low respect for the program and that history has devalued all awards say nothing about the ORMM program. These findings suggest that the most important forces which underly low esteem for the award are derived not from a value orientation toward the award itself, but instead come from a broader, cynical orientation toward the military institution in the most general sense. A supplementary conclusion is that the distrust for the ORMM selection process found earlier in this report does not impact on the esteem accorded to the overall program, and may thus be viewed as a less problematic discovery than would otherwise be the case.

57. The implications of this determination are substantial. The "problem" for the ORMM program is well beyond its own boundaries, and is not to be addressed by altering the configuration of the program itself. Low esteem for the ORMM comes rather from the military cynic, for whom no aspect of the military is as it should be or as good as it used to be - the ORMM is merely one such aspect.

STAGE THREE:

Independent Hypothesis Tests in Explaining Low Esteem

58. A number of alternative possible explanations of the source of the level of esteem accorded the ORMM were designed and built into the survey. The following hypothetical causal influences were tested:

- 1) Personnel dissatisfied with their military careers reject the ORMM because it symbolizes success;

- 2) Personnel with relatively successful careers are supportive of the award;
- 3) Members with an "institutional" enrollment motivation are more supportive of the award than those with an "occupational" orientation; and
- 4) Increasing knowledge of the program is associated with increasing support for it.

59. Respondents were asked to identify their overall satisfaction with their service in the Canadian Forces on a five-point scale ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied". It was hypothesized that low satisfaction and low esteem for the ORMM would be related. Support was not found for this contention. The only significant finding to emerge from the analysis was that personnel describing themselves as very satisfied with their military service with a mean esteem score of 4.22 (n=202), are significantly more supportive of the ORMM than the overall population ($t=4.381$, $p<.01$).

60. Career success was measured in three ways (Rank achievement has been shown not to impact on esteem for the award earlier in this report). These comprised being awarded a medal of the ORMM, being awarded a CD, and having been promoted in the previous twelve months. The only statistically significant finding in these tests is unworthy of note; those receiving a medal of the ORMM are more supportive of the program than those who have not ($t=3.736$, $p<.01$).

61. Motivation has been shown to be of great importance in considering a wide range of issues regarding military service (see Cotton, 1979; Crook, 1975; Janowitz, 1977; Moskos, 1986). Personnel with an "institutional" orientation are supportive of the traditional norms and demands of military service, while those with an "occupational" orientation view their military work as a job. It was hypothesized that personnel with an institutional enrollment orientation would be more supportive of the symbolic role of the ORMM award program than those with an occupational orientation. An institutional/occupational enrollment motivation scale was included in the survey to test this notion. While the mean esteem score was in fact higher among institutional respondents, at 3.97 (n=392) against 3.86 (n=230), this difference was not statistically significant.

62. Finally, it was hypothesized that the more familiar are members with the program, the more supportive of it they will be. This was found to be the case. With a mean esteem score of 4.22 (n=65), those personnel "very familiar" with the program were found to be significantly more favourably disposed toward the program than the overall population at the 1% level ($t=2.551$, $p<.01$). Those "somewhat familiar" had a mean esteem score of 4.03, statistically no different from the overall population mean, and those "a little bit familiar" were significantly below the overall mean ($t=-2.154$, $p<.01$) at the 1% level with an esteem score of 3.81. This finding suggests that low esteem for the program may be in part a function of low knowledge of it; those who are familiar with it are more likely to be supportive of it.

63. This section has sought to specify both that sector of the Forces in which esteem for the ORMM is lowest and those factors underlying low esteem. It was found that a clear socio-demographic location of low esteem was not to be found, but that esteem was lowest among junior officers and among personnel in air operational trades and classifications. The air operational sector was identified as the most problematic for the image of the ORMM - air ops personnel are least supportive of it, least familiar with it, and least able to recognize it. The factors most importantly impacting on low esteem were found to be unconnected with the award itself or its processes, the broader rejection of all elements of the military institution by the military cynic being chief among these. The implications of this finding are that the level of low esteem for the program will be resilient; that a change in ORMM policy will not improve its image as low esteem is not being generated by the program itself. However, it was found that familiarity with the program and esteem are positively associated, suggesting that increasing the profile of the program may enhance overall esteem.

SECTION FOUR:

LATENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ORMM PROGRAM

64. To this point in the report the results of the first phase of the study have been reported. The findings of that phase were derived though the application of a traditional survey, measuring manifest attitudes through direct questioning. While this technique allows the generation of statistically generalizable findings that are applicable to a very large population, its weakness lies in the difficulty of capturing the "true" beliefs of people. Often we are not aware of the set of ideas that define our perceptions of social life, and it is a rare survey instrument that is so finely constructed as to extract and measure the content of belief on this latent level. A second phase was designed for this study which attempted to gather data regarding the latent attitudes of personnel toward the ORMM program.

65. The technique employed for this purpose is described in more detail earlier in this report. In brief, it is based upon an existing methodology used by Labovitz (1979), Larimer (1970), and Goldberg (1968) among others. In each of these studies, respondents in a control group and an experimental group evaluated the quality of a short piece of written work. The written work given to each group was the same, but the name of the author accompanying it was changed to reflect particular linguistic, ethnic, and sexual backgrounds. When the relative perceived quality of the work was compared statistically, it was found that latent attitudes about women and minority groups influenced the judgement of the respondents, who believed that the same works when apparently written by an anglo-saxon male was of

significantly higher quality. For this research, a summary of a previous DSEA report was sent to two samples of 1,000 military personnel each; the first group receiving the summary, which was identified as having been authored by a Major J.D. Richard, as well as a questionnaire about its quality. The second group received the same summary and questionnaire, but the author was clearly identified as Major J.D. Richard, OMM. Of the 2,000 questionnaires that were administered, 748 valid responses were received. The response rate of 37.4% is acceptable for this type of survey.

66. The questionnaire asked respondents to evaluate the overall quality of the summary, judge the importance of the issues in it, determine how convincing were the arguments made by the author, identify the extent to which they agreed with the authors conclusions, as well as to consider how appropriate were a set of possible adjectives in describing the author. These included "intelligent", "careless", "conscientious", and a number of others. If military personnel harbour strong feelings in any direction about the ORMM program, these should have been revealed by differences between the responses of the two groups to the questionnaire.

67. The findings must be interpreted carefully. In terms of the central measure, that of the overall quality of the written work, the sample believing it was written by an officer with the OMM found it of significantly higher quality than did the control group ($t=1.892$, $p<.05$). The quality scale mean scores (ranging from 1 to 5) were 3.33 ($n=375$, $sd=.77$) and 3.22 ($n=359$, $sd=.82$) respectively. Also, the summary generated significantly greater agreement with its information and conclusions when it was believed to

have been authored by an officer with an OMM ($t=2.562$, $p<.01$). While these findings appear to lend support to the favourable direction of the responses found in Phase 1, the overall findings generated by the data gathered in this phase do not indicate enough of a consistently significant difference between the groups to permit this conclusion. Of the twelve measures of evaluation between the two samples, ten found higher positive scores among the group with the author having the OMM. Of these ten, which indicate greater esteem for the ORMM, only two were higher to a statistically significant degree. Table 14 contains the results of the twelve comparisons between the two evaluations of the same document.

68. A more sophisticated statistical test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), has greater sensitivity than the t-test in identifying differences among categorical data. A one-way ANOVA was conducted with the two evaluations of the report in confirming the findings discussed on the previous paragraph. Substantial confidence was lent to those conclusions, as the ANOVA tests produced very similar results. These are contained in Table 15. Perceptions of the quality of the report and the level of agreement with its information and conclusions were the only evaluation factors in which a difference was found between the two groups (in fact, ANOVA diminishes the strength of the significance of the former, with p at .059). While members of the CF have respect for the abilities of those awarded the ORMM, they are not viewed as being dramatically different from other personnel.

69. While the possession of the ORMM lent significant credibility to the written work in the eyes of the respondents, the main conclusion must be that the ORMM is

TABLE 14

Significance Tests for Differences Between
Mean Sample Evaluation Scores

<u>Evaluation Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u> <u>Author with</u> <u>OMM Sample</u>	<u>Mean Score</u> <u>Author without</u> <u>OMM Sample</u>	<u>t=</u>	<u>p<</u>
1. Quality of the report	3.33	3.22	1.89	.05
2. Agree with the report	4.04	3.88	2.56	.01
3. Author was convincing	2.63	2.63	-0.04	-
4. Importance of issues in report	3.71	3.67	0.91	-
5. Author is intelligent	3.01	2.93	1.51	-
6. Conscientious	2.88	2.83	0.87	-
7. Honest	3.09	3.00	1.44	-
8. Arrogant	1.44	1.44	-0.08	-
9. Committed	2.96	2.89	0.98	-
10. Loyal	3.10	3.09	0.05	-
11. Careless	1.50	1.50	0.00	-
12. A good officer	3.04	2.96	1.80	-

TABLE 15

One-Way Analysis of Variance Between Sample Evaluations

<u>Evaluation Factor</u>	<u>Sum of</u> <u>Squares</u>	<u>Df</u>	<u>F-ratio</u> <u>Statistic</u>	<u>p=</u>
1. Quality of the report	2.25	1	3.57	.06
2. Agree with the report	4.72	1	6.58	.01
3. Author was convincing	0.00	1	0.00	.97
4. Importance of issues in report	0.25	1	0.80	.37
5. Author is intelligent	0.94	1	2.28	.13
6. Conscientious	0.49	1	0.76	.38
7. Honest	1.34	1	2.11	.15
8. Arrogant	0.00	1	0.01	.94
9. Committed	0.65	1	0.94	.33
10. Loyal	0.00	1	0.00	.96
11. Careless	0.00	1	0.00	.99
12. A good officer	0.79	1	1.16	.28

seen with some ambiguity. Personnel receiving it are viewed positively, but in a generic way - they are not viewed as outstanding members, or as worthy of specific admiration. There is not a current of strong opinion about the program. This finding echoes the frustrating dichotomy revealed earlier in this report. While the award and the people possessing it are accorded respect and credibility in the main, these are not deeply felt, and as we have seen earlier, a minority suspects that the process of awarding it is unfair. Despite the fact that this suspicion does not diminish the esteem accorded the award, in the light of the data gathered in this second phase of the research it is concluded that the ORMM has won the minds, but not the hearts, of military personnel in Canada. The program has their respect, but not their admiration. Even those who reject it do so not passionately, but because it seems to them just like everything else the military offers.

70. The "problem" with the ORMM that is indicated by all the findings generated by this research has nothing to do with what the award is, and everything to do with what it is not. There is no question that most personnel view the program favourably. They do not, however, feel a particular connection with it or a strong attachment to it. The members who receive it are seen as devoted, deserving people but are not seen as a group with special characteristics that are beyond the pale. In the final analysis, the program is not viewed as worthy of remarkable admiration. Military personnel in peacetime are very difficult to impress - hence the prevalence of the cynic. The standard of courage set by the weight of military history does not easily allow the provision of status. Honour in military forces is closely connected with sacrifice, and it is for those who sacrifice themselves that the most revered awards

are reserved. It is this reverence that the ORMM has failed to attain. It may not be reasonable to expect that the ORMM program should generate more than a broad and wide favourable opinion and a substantial degree of respect.

SECTION FIVE:

THE FUTURE OF THE ORMM

71. A segment was included in the conclusion of the Phase 1 survey that permitted the respondents the opportunity to express their opinions regarding both what should happen to the program in the future and also what selection criteria they would prefer to see employed. This information was intended as an exploratory adjunct to the study, collected for its potential independent use by the sponsor.

72. The data contained in Table 16 comprise the distribution of responses to a question asking respondents to select a statement most closely approximating their own attitude toward the future of the program. A majority believe that the program should be maintained if changes are made (58.6%, n=379), while more than one in four (27.5%, n=178) believe that the program should not only continue but should do so in its present form. An insignificant number of personnel would see the program cancelled completely (1.4%, n=9). In consonance with the broader conclusions of the research proper, it is observed that while most wish to keep the program, only a minority feel strongly about it in its present form.

73. A list of potential selection criteria was presented to the respondents, who indicated their opinion regarding the role each should play in the future of the program on a four-point importance scale ranging from "very important" to "not at all important". Thirteen of these were considered by a majority of personnel to be very or somewhat important to the future of the award and its process of identifying members for selection, and these are listed in Table 17 in descending order of importance. These are the criteria which personnel believe should be employed in deciding who will be included among those members deserving the award.

TABLE 16

Overall Attitudes Toward The Future Of The ORMM Program

	<u>%</u>	<u>n=</u>
Maintain the ORMM in its present form	27.5	178
Maintain the ORMM with some changes	58.6	379
Cancel the ORMM, create a new award	2.3	15
Cancel the ORMM completely	1.4	9
Don't know, no opinion	<u>10.2</u>	<u>66</u>
Total	100.0	647

TABLE 17

Selection Criteria Factors for the Future of the
Program Supported By A Majority of Personnel

	<u>% Supporting</u>	<u>n=</u>
1. Integrity and honesty	88.5	437
2. Ensuring NCM's are properly included	85.9	910
3. Proven personal commitment to the CF	82.7	876
4. Loyalty to subordinates	82.0	868
5. Outstanding leadership abilities	79.3	840
6. Exceptional performance in positions of responsibility over the long term	78.4	830
7. Ensuring female pers properly included	75.2	797
8. Loyalty to superiors	74.2	786
9. Courage in decision-making	72.3	765
10. Contribution to CF admin, efficiency	70.8	749
11. Bravery under conditions of extreme peril	64.4	682
12. Willingness to go into combat	54.1	572
13. Ensuring reservists properly included	52.5	556

CONCLUSION

74. This report has presented the finding of a two-phased study of the attitudes of military personnel in Canada toward the Order of Military Merit (ORMM) award program. The main findings of this research concern awareness of the program, the overall esteem accorded the program, the identification of factors influencing that esteem, and the illumination of the latent orientation underlying perceptions of the award.

75. Awareness of the program may be described as low. More than one in three members (37.6%) were found to have no familiarity with the program at all. Of those who are familiar, the program is very much the province of the senior officer, who is more than ten times as likely to be very familiar with the program as are all other personnel combined.

76. A full 72.5% of all personnel describe their overall attitude toward the program as favourable or strongly favourable. As well, the ORMM is viewed by the great majority as a credible and worthwhile means of honouring CF personnel. A minority of personnel, however, were found to distrust the process used in selecting those personnel who receive the award, including the finding that 44.1% believe that the award is given for the wrong reasons.

77. Esteem for the program was found to be lowest among junior officers and among personnel in air operational trades and classifications. The air operational sector emerged as a singularly problematic one for the image of the ORMM - that group exhibited lowest esteem for the program, were least familiar with it, and least able to recognize it.

78. In the identification of factors most importantly associated with esteem for the award, it was found that distrust for some concrete aspects of the program did not diminish the respect accorded it. The finding of distrust may as a result be considered to have less significance than would otherwise be the case. The factors found to be most strongly associated with low esteem for the program reflected broader problems having no connection to the ORMM itself; the award is held in low esteem by the military cynic who rejects all aspects of military bureaucracy. It is thus concluded that expensive proposed alterations to the program designed to enhance its reputation among military personnel are unlikely to be effective. It was found, however, that familiarity with the program and esteem are positively associated, suggesting that increasing awareness might improve the overall image of the program.

79. On the level of opinion, the findings to this point indicated a strongly favourable overall orientation to the program on the part of military personnel, and further that the low esteem that was found was not related to any difficulty with the program itself but was the product of broader negative orientations. However, the problem of the distrust for the process remained, and in consonance with the findings of the investigation of latent attitudes toward the program, a definition of the problem facing the ORMM was generated.

80. Military personnel were found not to have strong feelings for the ORMM awards. They respect them, they see them as legitimate symbols of quality performance, but they do not admire the program. There is a missing dimension here, one which might not be reasonably expected to be filled. There may be an assumption at work that the ORMM

should be, or could be, more than it is. The ORMM has not been taken to heart by the Forces, and the esteem which it has accrued is not felt deeply. The program will likely not generate this kind of affective support, which medals perhaps traditionally acquire, without selection criteria resonating on a level such that members link the medal with achievement on an historical scale. The award is not designed for this, of course, and this standard of reverence is inappropriately applied to the ORMM. The research concludes that military personnel in Canada view the ORMM in a strongly favourable light in its role as a means to recognize personnel who contribute consistently and significantly to a peacetime military institution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- COTTON, C.A. Military Attitudes and Values of the Army in Canada. Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit. Report 79-5. 1979.
- CROOK, R.K. The Armed Forces in the Context of Rapid Social Change. Operational Research and Analysis Establishment (ORAE) Report No. R55. April 1975.
- GOLDBERG, P. "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women". Trans-Action. April 1968, Pp. 28-30.
- JANOWITZ, M. "From Institutional to Occupational". Armed Forces and Society. Vol. 4, No. 1, November 1977. Pp. 51-54.
- LABOVITZ, S. "Some Evidence of Sexual, Ethnic, and Racial Antagonism" in Curtis, J.E. and Scott, W.G.eds. Social Stratification: Canada. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall. 1979. Pp. 333-339.
- LARIMER, G. "Indirect Assessment of Intercultural Prejudices". International Journal of Psychology. Vol. 5, No. 3, 1970. Pp. 189-195.
- MOSKOS, G. "Institutional/Occupational Trends in Armed Forces: An Update". Armed Forces and Society. Vol. 12, No. 3, Spring 1986. Pp. 377-382.

PHASE 1 SURVEY

1. What is your present military rank? Circle the number next to the appropriate response.

Senior Officer	1
Junior Officer	2
Senior NCM	3
Junior NCM, Pte	4

2. What is your current military status?

Regular Force	1
Primary Reserve Class "B" or "C"	2
Primary Reserve	3

3. Which statement best describes your current type of military employment?

Operational Land	1
Operational Air	2
Operational Sea	3
Admin, Pers, or Log- primarily in active support to an operational land, air, or sea unit	4
Admin, Pers, or Log- primarily in a base or static role	5

4. If you are an officer, put your two-digit classification code in the spaces below. If you are an NCM or do not know your classification, leave the spaces blank.

— —

5. If you are an NCM, put your three-digit MOC code in the spaces below. If you are an officer or do not know your MOC, leave the spaces blank.

— — —

6. In terms of your entire military career, which of the statements below best describes your service?

Combat role, in any environment	1
Combat support role, in any environment	2
Admin, Pers, or Log specialist	3
Technical specialist	4

7. How many years have you served? If you have served less than one full year, respond with a "1". If you are in the regular force, count only your time in the regular force.

_____ years of service

8. How old were you on your most recent birthday?

_____ years of age

9. What is your sex?

Male 1
Female 2

10. What is your primary language?

English 1
French 2
Other 3

11. Please consider for a moment your feelings toward your military experiences, your career, your day-to-day work, your pay and working conditions, your prospects for promotion, and the people you work with. Adding up all the good and bad points, how satisfied are you with your service in the Canadian Forces?

Very satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Neither satisfied nor unsatisfied 3
Unsatisfied 4
Very unsatisfied 5
Don't know 6

12. From the list below, select the three most important reasons that motivated your decision to join the Canadian Forces. Circle the numbers next to the three most important reasons.

To have a job 1
To serve the country 2
A chance to travel 3
Excitement, adventure 4
To learn skills useful in civilian life 5
Pay and benefits 6
To become more independent 7
Wanted a challenge 8
To have a part-time job or a summer job 9
Joined reserves as a way into regular force 10
Wanted discipline 11
Family tradition 12

12. (Continued)

Other (please specify):

13. Have you been awarded a Canadian Forces Decoration (CD)?

Yes 1
No 2
Don't know 3

14. Have you been awarded the Order of Military Merit (ORMM);
either the MMM, OMM, or CMM?

Yes 1
No 2
Don't know 3

15. Have you been promoted in the past twelve months?

Yes 1
No 2

16. Would you be able to recognize a medal of the Order of
Military Merit (ORMM) if you saw someone wearing one?

Yes 1
No 2
Don't know 3

17. Overall, how familiar would you say that you are with the
Order of Military Merit (ORMM) program?

Very familiar 1
Somewhat familiar 2
A little bit familiar 3
Not at all familiar 4

* If you responded "Not at all familiar" to question *
* 17, please skip questions 18 to 27 and go directly *
* to question 28. If you responded in any other way *
* to question 17, please continue with the next question. *

18. According to CF policy, what is the ORMM awarded for? Choose only one.

- Distinguished public service
to Canadian society 1
- Acts of courage in circumstances
of extreme peril 2
- Outstanding meritorious service
in positions of responsibility 3
- Performance beyond the demands
of normal duty 4
- Don't know 5

19. Approximately how many members of the CF, regular and reserve, do you believe are awarded the ORMM every year?

- 25 or fewer 1
- 26 to 50 2
- 51 to 75 3
- 76 to 100 4
- 101 to 150 5
- 151 or more 6
- Don't know 7

20. Which of the statements below best describes your overall attitude toward the ORMM?

- Strongly favorable 1
- Favorable 2
- Neither favorable nor unfavorable 3
- Unfavorable 4
- Strongly unfavorable 5
- Don't know 6

21. In this section, you are asked to identify how important you believe a variety of factors are in the actual process of deciding which members of the CF are selected to receive the ORMM. In other words, how important in your opinion are each of the following factors "in the real world" in awarding the ORMM? Circle the number below the response you believe is appropriate.

Very	Somewhat	A little bit	Not at all	Don't
<u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Know</u>

1) Meritorious service in positions of responsibility

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

21. (Continued)

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>A little bit Important</u>	<u>Not at all Important</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
2) A consolation award for people who are retiring	1	2	3	4	5
3) Having outstanding leadership skills	1	2	3	4	5
4) Being a good bureaucrat or manager	1	2	3	4	5
5) Personally knowing high-ranking people	1	2	3	4	5
6) Devotion to duty	1	2	3	4	5
7) Having an unblemished record	1	2	3	4	5
8) Achieving high-profile command positions	1	2	3	4	5
9) Contributing actively to the community	1	2	3	4	5
10) Being a good "military politician"	1	2	3	4	5
11) Having a high-quality nomination proposal written	1	2	3	4	5
12) Dedication and dependability	1	2	3	4	5
13) Having graduated from a military college	1	2	3	4	5

21. (Continued)

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>A little bit Important</u>	<u>Not at all Important</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
14) Regular Force pers more likely than Reservists to be awarded	1	2	3	4	5
15) Courage in making decisions	1	2	3	4	5
16) Never complaining about or disagreeing with policy	1	2	3	4	5
17) Luck; being in the right place at the right time	1	2	3	4	5
18) Operational pers more likely than support pers to be awarded	1	2	3	4	5
19) Officers more likely than other ranks to be awarded	1	2	3	4	5
20) Male pers more likely than female pers to be awarded	1	2	3	4	5
21) Loyalty to superiors	1	2	3	4	5
22) Loyalty to subordinates	1	2	3	4	5
23) Bravery in conditions of extreme danger	1	2	3	4	5

Other (please specify):

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

21. (Continued)

<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>A little bit</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Not at all</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Don't</u> <u>Know</u>
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5

22. Briefly review the list of factors in question 21. Select the three factors which you believe to be the most important in determining "in the real world" who receives the ORMM. Rank the three factors in order of importance, and identify them in the spaces below using the number from 1 to 23 that is associated with each factor. If you don't know or have no answer, please put "0" in the appropriate spaces.

Most important factor — —
 Next most important factor ... — —
 Next important factor — —

23. In your opinion, how much special respect do members who receive an ORMM medal (either the MMM, OMM, or CMM) get from other members of the Forces?

Very high respect 1
 Some special respect 2
 A little bit of extra respect 3
 No extra respect at all 4
 Don't know 5

24. In your opinion, where should the award ceremony for those receiving the ORMM be held?

Rideau Hall in Ottawa (the Governor General's residence)	1
At the members' units	2
Doesn't matter where the ceremony is held ...	3
Don't know	4

25. In this section, you are asked to provide your opinions on issues related to the ORMM by indicating the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

- 1) "The ORMM is a credible and worthwhile way of honouring deserving members of the Canadian military"

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5
Don't know	6

- 2) "The ORMM is awarded to people for the wrong reasons; the people in the Forces who most deserve to be rewarded often are not the people who receive it"

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5
Don't know	6

- 3) "The ORMM is really a 'Super CD ' that is awarded not necessarily to exceptional personnel but to those who stay in for a full career and are very loyal"

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5
Don't know	6

25. (Continued)

- 4) "The ORMM means very little. It is just part of the bureaucracy, which is too large and inefficient"

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5
Don't know	6

- 5) "Most members of the Forces whom I have talked to about the ORMM have little respect for the program"

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5
Don't know	6

- 6) "The way I see it, there is not much difference between the ORMM and the other awards the CF gives out, like the CD and so on. None of them are really special"

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5
Don't know	6

- 7) "Awards of all kinds in the Forces don't mean as much as they used to"

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5
Don't know	6

25. (Continued)

- 8) "Too many awards of all kinds are given out for any of them to really matter"

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5
Don't know	6

26. In which of the following ways have you heard or received information about the ORMM? Please indicate whether you have or have not heard about the ORMM from each of the possible sources listed below.

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Base, unit, or other military newspaper	1	2
Civilian newspapers, television, or radio	1	2
Have known someone personally (other than myself) who was awarded the ORMM	1	2
From talking about it with other personnel	1	2
From official CF notices or documentation	1	2
Participated in the nomination of another member for the award ..	1	2
Was awarded it myself	1	2
Other (please specify)		

27. Which of the following statements best describes your attitude toward the future of the ORMM program?

Maintain the ORMM in its present form	1
Maintain the ORMM with some changes	2
Cancel the ORMM and create a new award program to replace it	3
Cancel the ORMM completely	4
Don't know	5

28. In this last section, you are asked to tell us which qualities and factors you believe should be important in determining which members receive the ORMM. Consider each of the possible qualities and factors listed below, and decide how important in your opinion each should be in deciding who should be rewarded with a medal of the ORMM. Please use the space provided at the end of the section to identify qualities and factors you believe should be important which have not been mentioned.

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>A little bit Important</u>	<u>Not at all Important</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
1) Exceptional performance in positions of great responsibility over the long term.	1	2	3	4	5
2) Outstanding leadership abilities	1	2	3	4	5
3) Proven personal commitment to the Canadian Forces	1	2	3	4	5
4) Loyalty to superiors	1	2	3	4	5
5) Exceptional performance in a particular project or short-term position	1	2	3	4	5
6) Having served largely in an operational rather than a support role	1	2	3	4	5
7) Bravery under conditions of extreme peril	1	2	3	4	5
8) Courage in decision-making	1	2	3	4	5
9) Loyalty to subordinates	1	2	3	4	5

28. (Continued)

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>A little bit Important</u>	<u>Not at all Important</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
10) Integrity and honesty	1	2	3	4	5
11) Willingness to go into combat	1	2	3	4	5
12) Remarkable and consistent contribution to the efficient organization and administration of the Canadian Forces	1	2	3	4	5
13) Outstanding technical or scientific skills	1	2	3	4	5
14) Strong bureaucratic or managerial expertise	1	2	3	4	5
15) Being close to retirement	1	2	3	4	5
16) Ensuring that members of the Reserves are properly included in the award	1	2	3	4	5
17) Achievement of high-profile command positions	1	2	3	4	5
18) Ensuring that non-commissioned members are properly included in the award	1	2	3	4	5
19) Achievement of high rank at either the officer or NCM level	1	2	3	4	5
20) Ensuring that female personnel are properly included in the award	1	2	3	4	5

28. (Continued)

Very <u>Important</u>	Somewhat <u>Important</u>	A little bit <u>Important</u>	Not at all <u>Important</u>	Don't <u>Know</u>
--------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------

Other (please specify):

<hr/>				
<hr/>				
1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>				
<hr/>				
1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>				
<hr/>				
1	2	3	4	5

```

*****
*   Thank you for completing the survey.   *
*   Please place this questionnaire in the  *
*   envelope provided and mail it through  *
*   the DND postal system.                  *
*****

```

PHASE 2 SURVEY

Stress in the Canadian Armed Forces

by
Major J.D. Richard, OMM

The Directorate of Social and Economic Analysis (DSEA) of the Department of National Defence has conducted a study of stress among Canadian Forces military personnel. The results have recently been released, and will be of much interest not only to the policy-makers but to all personnel. All members must deal with the competing demands of our military service, our families, and other aspects of our lives. Our ability to deal with these demands greatly influences the quality of our work and our own well-being as individuals.

Most of us probably believe that the dangerous activities many members of the Forces perform creates stress. We may be surprised to learn, however, that other aspects of military life also result in substantial stress. For example, the most highly stressed group in the military are senior officers in technical and administrative classifications. They find that too much is asked of them and that they do not get the resources to do their jobs properly. They have a great deal of responsibility without much contact with the actual conduct of military operations. Junior officers and senior NCM's in operational classifications are the next most stressed groups in the Forces, and they feel as do most personnel that frequent separations from their families is a very important cause of stress in their lives and work.

The results of stress are, DSEA has shown, considerable. Personnel who find their service stressful have lower satisfaction in their military careers. They are significantly more likely to want to leave the Forces than those who experience less stress. The costs of training are of course so high that we must try to keep as many people as possible in uniform and at a high standard of readiness and morale.

As everyone knows, some stress is necessary and unavoidable in a military organization. We cannot reduce stress in ways that would decrease our operational effectiveness. With this in mind, DSEA has found that the best ways to reduce stress involve two principle factors: unit cohesion, and good leadership. Members in units with a strong sense of group identity, unity, or team spirit experience significantly lower stress than do personnel in units lacking those bonds. Also, personnel who believe that their superiors take an active and personal interest in their careers and day-to-day work report lower stress. The lessons DSEA have learned, in sum, are that we can reduce stress by reinforcing the classic military sense of belonging to a unit and by leaders knowing and caring about their people. Leaders in all trades and classifications, take note.

1. What is your present military rank? Please circle the number next to your response.

Senior Officer	1
Junior Officer	2
Senior NCM	3
Junior NCM, Pte	4

2. What is your current military status?

Regular Force	1
Primary Reserve Class B or C	2
Primary Reserve	3

3. In your opinion, what is the overall quality of the report you have just read?

Very high quality	1
High quality	2
Neither high nor low	3
Low quality	4
Very low quality	5
Don't know	6

4. How important do you believe the issues discussed in the report are for the Forces?

Very important	1
Somewhat important	2
A little bit important	3
Not important	4
Don't know	5

5. How convincing were the arguments made by the author?

Very convincing	1
Somewhat convincing	2
A little bit convincing	3
Not convincing	4
Don't know	5

6. In your view, was the style or "tone" of the report appropriate for the subject matter?

Yes, it was appropriate	1
No, a more serious tone needed	2
No, a less serious tone needed	3
Don't know	4

7. The report discussed a study, but provided no actual data. Should the report have included the technical material upon which the conclusions were based?

Yes, statistics needed 1
 No, statistics not needed 2
 Don't know 3

8. Which statement best describes the writing style you believe the author used in writing the report?

Technical or scientific 1
 Conversational 2
 Emotional 3
 Don't know 4

9. What is your reaction to the actual information contained in the report and its conclusion?

Strongly agree 1
 Agree 2
 Neither agree nor disagree 3
 Disagree 4
 Strongly disagree 5
 Don't know 6

10. Think now about your impressions of the author of the report. While you have not read much work by the author, please indicate how accurate you think each of the following possible descriptions are of the author. Read the report again if necessary.

	<u>Very Accurate</u>	<u>Somewhat Accurate</u>	<u>A Bit Accurate</u>	<u>Not at All Accurate</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5
Conscientious	1	2	3	4	5
Honest	1	2	3	4	5
Arrogant	1	2	3	4	5
Committed	1	2	3	4	5
Loyal	1	2	3	4	5
Careless	1	2	3	4	5
A Good Officer	1	2	3	4	5

11. In terms of clarity and ease of reading, how does the report compare with most DND publications and documents that you have read?

It is much more clearly written	1
It is more clearly written	2
Neither more nor less clear	3
It is less clearly written	4
It is much less clearly written	5
Don't know	6

12. In the space below, please make any comments or suggestions which you think might help improve the style of writing used in reports like the one included in this survey.

[illegible]

 * Thank you for completing the survey. *
 * Please place this questionnaire in the *
 * envelope provided and mail it through *
 * the DND postal system. *

#SD3830